

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



SUGAR REPORTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE
SUGAR DIVISION

WASHINGTON, D.C. JUNE 1955

NO. 38

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGES</u>
1. MARKET REVIEW	2-3
2. PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE SUGAR ACT - Testimony of True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, before the House Committee on Agriculture, June 23, 1955	4-9
3. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	9-10
4. STATISTICAL SERIES	11-19
a. Highlights	11-12
b. Receipts and meltings January-April 1955, deliveries by primary distributors May and January-May 1955 and 1954, and stocks at selected dates 1955 and 1954.	13-15
c. Status of quotas as of May 31 and June 13, 1955, and comparisons of charges to quotas January- May 1955	16-18
d. Deliveries of primary distributors by States, April 1955	19

MARKET REVIEW

During the first half of June the domestic raw sugar price, New York duty paid, averaged 6.03 cents per pound. For the first time in half a year it amounted to 6.00 cents or more for a continuous half-month period. It averaged 5.90 cents per pound from January through May as compared with 6.11 cents during the corresponding period of last year. The price of refined cane sugar in New York remained at 8.55 cents per pound, the level to which it declined on February 21 from its previous price of 8.65 cents. A year ago the price was 8.80 cents. Thus, the gross refining margin narrowed from an all time high (except 1920) of 2.73 cents in April and 2.60 cents in May to 2.52 cents during the first half of June. The April-June 1954 average margin was 2.65 cents.

Primary sugar deliveries during the week ended June 18 were somewhat larger than deliveries during the same week a year earlier. Cumulative deliveries from the beginning of the year to June 18 were 3,632,000 tons, about the same as deliveries from January 1 through June 19, 1954. Quota charges through the end of May amounted to about 3,500,000 short tons and ran about 383,000 tons ahead of primary deliveries during the same period. At this time of the year, quota charges typically exceed primary deliveries and during the past five years have ranged from 146,000 tons more in 1952 to 432,000 tons more in 1954. Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors on June 4, 1955, 1,658,000 short tons, raw value, were about 5 percent larger than a year ago and about 13 percent larger than the 1952-54 May end average stocks. The decrease from the end of April to the end of May was 95,000 tons. This change was contrary to the pattern during the three years 1952-54 when stocks averaged 60,000 tons larger at the end of May than at the end of April.

On June 20 the world market price dropped below the 3.25-cent floor of the International Sugar Agreement's "zone of stabilized prices." In mid-May, it had reached 3.41 cents, a maximum since August 1953. In the second half of May, the price receded slightly to 3.38 cents. A more rapid decline, from 3.35 cents to 3.27 cents, occurred between June 8 and 10. Developments preceding this decline were:

- (1) The International Sugar Council increased effective quotas of net exporting members by about 372,000 metric tons through the mechanism of deficit reallocations. It also authorized the exportation of all exporting members' effective quotas without any seasonal limitation. Without such authorization, exporting countries with basic export tonnages of more than 75,000 metric tons were not permitted to ship more than 80 percent of their initial quotas before September 1. Even if it is assumed that the East European countries will not export any sugar before their 1955 crop is available, the lifting of the seasonal restriction made an additional 1,163,063 metric tons of sugar immediately available to the world market. (This is the difference between the present, full, effective quotas of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and China (Formosa), and 80 percent of their initial quotas).
- (2) Brazil announced her non-participation in the International Sugar Agreement. This increased the possibility of Brazilian sugar offerings to the world market in addition to the 360,000 metric tons already sold (about 200,000 metric tons more than she could have exported as a member).
- (3) The International Sugar Council increased its estimate of free market requirements in 1955 by 100,000 metric tons (from 4,550,000 to 4,650,000 tons).
- (4) Since the increased estimate was established, Cuba sold to the Soviet Union an additional 82,000 metric tons of refined sugar.

Altogether, the market is placing somewhat greater stress on the fact that there is no shortage of sugar in the world. Cuba's 1955 crop amounted to 5,000,000 short tons. Her sales outside the United States, January through May, plus the most recent sale to the Soviet Union, the Cuban quota in the U. S. market, and Cuba's domestic sugar requirements total approximately 4,650,000 short tons.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SUGAR ACT

True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, Testimony
before the House Agriculture Committee on H.R. 5406,
June 23, 1955

Your Committee has before it H.R. 5406, a bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. A similar bill, S-1635, has been introduced in the Senate.

This bill would extend the life of the Sugar Act from its present expiration date of December 31, 1956, to December 31, 1962. It would become effective in the current calendar year and would increase the present fixed quotas for the domestic areas by 188,000 tons, plus additional amounts based upon increases in domestic sugar consumption. Of the fixed quota increases, the beet area would receive 85,000 tons, the mainland cane area 80,000 tons, Puerto Rico 20,000 tons, the Virgin Islands 3,000 tons, and Hawaii none. Additional quota based on 55 percent of sugar consumption in excess of 8,388,000 tons would be prorated among domestic areas on the basis of their revised fixed quotas. The bill also provides that any deficit which may occur in that part of a domestic area's quota resulting from consumption increases would be prorated, first to the other domestic areas and then in the event that no domestic area could fill such deficit, it would be prorated to Cuba. Direct-consumption allotments to Puerto Rico and Hawaii also would be raised in the proportion that their quotas are raised by increases in consumption.

A few brief observations about the sugar situation in general may be helpful. The Sugar Act, widely recognized as a successful farm legislation, is designed to make ample supplies of sugar available to consumers at reasonable prices, to maintain a healthy and competitive domestic sugar industry, and to promote our export trade. The Act also assures sugarcane and sugar beet farmers and field workers a fair share of the consumer's dollar. By and large, the Sugar Act has brought stability to a commodity which was notable for erratic price, production, and marketing behavior in the years before quota legislation.

Although this Act generally has been very successful in avoiding the piling up of really burdensome inventories, either in the hands of the Government or of industry, there has been a definite tendency in the last few years for stocks of sugar in the mainland

cane and beet areas to accumulate at above average levels. This situation has prompted the domestic sugar industry to seek relief from the present system of fixed domestic quotas through legislation this year rather than at the expiration of the present Act, which is December 31, 1956. Both acreage and sugar marketing restrictions are in effect in all of the domestic areas except Hawaii and the Virgin Islands and there is an understandable desire on the part of farmers in most areas to increase their production.

In the last few years, in both mainland areas, new varieties and improved production practices have increased production to levels well above the present marketing quotas. Unusually favorable weather conditions in Louisiana have also contributed to this situation. As a direct result, inventories in the mainland cane area are about one-quarter million tons above customary levels and in the mainland beet area are also somewhat above average; elsewhere the inventory situation is not pressing. In Puerto Rico, restrictions have held production at approximately the quota level, and in Hawaii production is also at quota level. Neither of those areas has excessive inventories and production in the Virgin Islands currently is below the quota level.

The Department recognizes the seriousness of the problems which face the domestic areas and particularly the mainland areas. We feel that the time now has come for the domestic areas to resume their historic sharing in market growth. When the Sugar Act of 1948 was enacted and again when it was extended in 1951, fixed quantity quotas were assigned to the domestic areas, even though they had under earlier sugar legislation received percentage quotas. This change, which continuously has been regarded by the domestic sugar industry as a temporary rather than a permanent one, was made mainly to assist Cuba in making the transition from war time to peace time conditions by assigning to Cuba and other foreign countries residual quotas which have grown as the domestic market has expanded.

Because of the lateness with which enactment of the Bill would occur, we do not, however, think it advisable that the bill be made effective as of last January, but rather recommend that it become effective January 1, 1956. Neither do we believe it advisable that domestic quotas be increased by the fixed quantities proposed in the bill. In lieu of the quota increases provided in the bill, we would recommend that the domestic areas share 55 percent of increases in consumer requirements in excess of 8,350,000 tons.

We recognize that there is need in the mainland areas for relief during the current year. Therefore, the Government, in order to avoid any retroactive aspect to the action will undertake to provide assistance through a special program to the extent of 100,000 tons in the year beginning July 1, 1955. The details of the program have yet to be worked out. The program will be worked out in a manner that will afford domestic areas relief as promptly as possible within the framework set forth above.

We recommend a system of priorities designed to assign quota increases resulting from population growth first to the mainland areas and then to the offshore domestic areas in 1956. Domestic quotas subsequent to 1956 would be based upon the final 1956 pattern.

We believe some increase should be made in the direct-consumption portion of quotas for offshore domestic areas.

We also wish to bring to your attention a number of technical problems that have arisen in connection with the definitions and administrative provisions of the Sugar Act. These matters are discussed in more detail as an addendum to our report to the Committee. Most of them have been reviewed with members of the industry and some have been reviewed in publications. The problems stemming from definitions were discussed at a special industry meeting which we called in September 1954, following which an Industry Task Force was appointed to consider the problems. Unfortunately, the Task Force Report contained divergent views and, consequently, could not be used as a single basis for recommendations. However, the views expressed in the Task Force Report and other similar expressions of representatives of the beet and mainland cane areas and Hawaii and of other persons, all have been considered in arriving at our recommendations.

Title I of the Sugar Act defines various terms and factors which serve as a basis for interpreting the provisions of the Act. These definitions have remained virtually unchanged since they were introduced into the Sugar Act of 1937. Although questions with respect to some of the definitions were raised as early as 1937, developments and changing conditions in the sugar industry recently have increased both their frequency and their scope.

One problem is that of differentiating between raw and direct-consumption sugar. Under the Sugar Act, the differentiation is quite important in view of the limitations on the portions of foreign

and offshore domestic quotas that may be filled with direct-consumption sugar. Although little difficulty arises with respect to typical raw sugar used for refining or typical refined sugar used for direct consumption, considerable difficulty arises with respect to small quantities of semi-refined sugars that are characteristically used for direct-consumption and with high purity sugars which now are desired by some refiners as a raw material.

In recent years, the difficulty of differentiating between the two types of sugar has become more pronounced, partly because of technological developments and partly because of changing attitudes within the industry.

Because of the growing demand by refiners for high-quality sugar, some refiners have asked the Department to permit them to import semi-refined and even fully refined sugars as raw sugar to be "further refined or improved in quality." Throughout the administration of the Act, the Department has held that semi-refined sugars such as turbinados and plantation granulated sugars are direct-consumption sugars and should be charged to the direct-consumption portions of quotas. Such administrative actions have been based upon the evident intent of Congress and have had the effect of supplementing the use criterion expressed in the Act to differentiate between raw and direct-consumption sugars with a quality criterion.

We believe more comprehensive legislation is needed on this point. It appears that the most acceptable solution to this problem would be to redefine raw and direct-consumption sugars, to define the term "to be further refined or improved in quality" and to authorize the Secretary to determine whether specific processes meet the requirements of the definition of refining and whether sugars of a given quality are raw or direct-consumption sugar.

The quota status of offshore domestic liquid sugar potentially poses another serious problem. The Sugar Act does not directly address itself to the question of the classification for quota purposes of such liquid sugar as either raw sugar or direct-consumption sugar. The Act defines direct-consumption sugar as any sugars which are principally of crystalline structure and which are not to be further refined or otherwise improved in quality. As the Act further provides that sugar in dry amorphous form shall be considered to be of crystalline structure, liquid sugar would not appear to be included within the literal meaning of direct-consumption sugar. Consequently, literal interpretation might permit the entire quota of an offshore domestic area to be filled with liquid sugar of refined

quality. Obviously, this is not in keeping with the over-all intent of the Act. Therefore, administrative actions pertaining to this problem have had to be based upon the evident intent of the Act rather than upon its precise wording. The suggested revisions in the definitions would make it clear that liquid sugar from offshore domestic areas is to be treated the same as crystalline sugar.

One of our difficult administrative problems arises in connection with Section 407 of the Act, which prohibits any person acting in an official capacity from investing or speculating in sugar or any stocks of sugar companies, or even being a member of a sugar processing cooperative. Until recently, this provision had been interpreted as applying only to Washington officials since they are the only ones having advance market information which could be used for personal gain. However, as a result of an inquiry by the General Accounting Office, the Department's General Counsel recently informally advised us that the provisions of Section 407 apply to any person acting in an official capacity, including State, county, and community officials and employees. The application of this provision to officials who have knowledge that might aid them in investing or speculating in sugar is consistent with principles of sound administration. However, it serves no useful purpose to have it apply to officials and employees in field offices and other agencies of Government. In some cases, the Department has been precluded from obtaining the services of persons who are best qualified to serve in such posts. The difficulties are most acute and embarrassing to the Department in areas served by cooperative sugar mills. For this reason, we recommend that Section 407 be amended so that it will not apply to persons employed in the field offices and other governmental agencies.

Another administrative problem arises in connection with the International Sugar Agreement which was ratified by and with the advice and consent of the Senate on April 29, 1954. Under the terms of Article 7 of the Agreement, each participant agrees to import no more sugar from non-participating countries as a group than it imported from such countries in any one of the years 1951 to 1953. As quotas of foreign countries under the Sugar Act are not allotted on the basis of the International Sugar Agreement, the United States last year was in slight violation of the Agreement. We wish authority to reconcile quotas covering imports from foreign countries with Article 7 of the Agreement or the corresponding provision of successor agreements. The amendment will restrict quotas of only those countries that do not participate in the International Sugar Agreement.

Two additional matters involve those provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, which originated in Title IV of the Sugar Act of 1937. They concern the processing tax on sugar manufactured in the United States and the import compensating tax on sugar manufactured outside the United States. Section 212 of the Sugar Act exempts from quota control any sugar, or liquid sugar, which is used for livestock feed or for the distillation of alcohol. However, tax exemption under the Internal Revenue Code is only partly consistent with the quota exemption. The processing tax on sugar is refundable on sugar used for livestock feed or for the distillation of alcohol, but the import compensating tax is not refundable on sugar used for the same purposes. In the interests of consistency, we recommend that those parts of the Code relating to the refund of taxes be amended so that the import compensating tax also can be refunded on manufactured sugar imported for livestock feed or for the distillation of alcohol.

Section 101(i) of the Sugar Act specified that the Clerget method must be used to determine sucrose in measurement of "total sugar content." This method has been superseded by more accurate methods. To permit the most accurate method of determination to be used, it is recommended that Section 101(i) of the Sugar Act be amended by deleting the term "(Clerget)". To enable this change to be put into practice fully, it will also be necessary to amend paragraph (4) of Section 4502 of the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate the reference to methods of testing. The proposed changes have the support of the Treasury Department.

The Sugar Act has provided an assured market for both our domestic industry and our principal foreign suppliers. At the same time, the interests of consumers have been protected under the Act. This will continue to be the case under the proposed amendments to the Act. The Department recommends that the Act be continued through the adoption of H. R. 5406 as modified by our recommendations.

SUGAR ACT OF 1948 - ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Date announced

Administrative action

June 3, 1955

Allotment of the 1955 Sugar Quotas for the Domestic Beet Sugar Area. Such allotment replaces preliminary allotments announced December 27, 1954; is based on hearing initially held on December 13, 1954, and reconvened on May 6, 1955; and reflects the

<u>Date announced</u>	<u>Administrative action (continued)</u>
June 3, 1955	unanimous recommendation of the processors concerned.
June 8, 1955	Fair and Reasonable Prices for 1955 crop sugar beets. In regions other than Imperial Valley, California, prices not less than those provided for in 1955 crop purchase contracts shall be used as the basis for settlement for sugar beets. In the Imperial Valley, the price shall be not less than provided in 1955 crop sugar beet contracts when negotiated between the processor and producers; if such contracts are not negotiated, or if those negotiated are deemed by the Secretary to be inequitable, the determination will be amended.
June 13, 1955	Informal public hearing to receive views and recommendations for use in establishing restrictive proportionate shares (farm acreage allotments) for the 1956 sugar beet crop in the domestic beet sugar area. The hearing, initially scheduled for 10:00 a.m., June 27, has been rescheduled to begin at 7:30 p.m., June 27, 1955, in Room 218, Administration Building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
June 24, 1955	Revised Hawaiian farm proportionate shares determination (acreage allotments) for the 1955 and subsequent crops. The new determination is designed to maintain the existing balance between the acreage of sugarcane cultivated by processors-producers and the acreage cultivated by independent growers.
June 28, 1955	Informal public hearing on 1956 Mainland Sugarcane Allotments. A 1955 sugar production which may be in excess of quota levels necessitates continuation of farm proportionate shares (acreage allotments) for 1956 sugarcane crop. The hearing will begin at 10:00 a.m., (c.s.t.), July 13, 1955, in the International House, 611 Gravier Street, New Orleans, Louisiana.

STATISTICAL SERIES IN THIS ISSUEHIGHLIGHTS

1. May deliveries of sugar for United States consumption, 696,000 short tons (preliminary), 76,000 tons larger than the preceding month, and 41,000 tons larger than May 1954. For the 5-month period January-May 1955, such deliveries totaled 3,158,000 tons, 46,000 tons more than for the corresponding period of 1954. Beet processors and importers' total deliveries up 46,000 tons, and 38,000 tons, respectively; refiners' deliveries down 17,000 tons, and mainland sugarcane mills down 15,000 tons.
2. Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors on June 4, 1955, 1,658,000 tons (preliminary), 84,000 tons larger than on May 31, 1954, but 95,000 tons smaller than on April 30, 1955. Beet processors' stocks on June 4, 1955, 840,000 tons, down 140,000 tons from April 30 this year, but up 124,000 tons from May 31, 1954. Refiners' refined stocks, 301,000 tons on June 4, 1955, up 10,000 tons from April 30, but down 28,000 tons from about a year ago; refiners' raw stocks, 372,000 tons, up 44,000 tons from April 30, but smaller by 14,000 tons than on May 31, 1954. Importers' stocks on June 4, 1955, 79,000 tons, down 12,000 tons and 10,000 tons, respectively.
3. Charges to quotas during January-May 1955, 3,525,000 tons, 0.5 percent smaller than during the corresponding period of 1954. Through May 31, 1955, about 43 percent of this year's present 8,200,000 total quota had been filled. For domestic beet sugar, greatest production of which comes in the fall months, 37 percent of the quota had been filled to May 31. The degree to which the other 1955 quotas had been filled through May 31 were: Mainland cane, 52 percent; Hawaii, 28 percent; Puerto Rico, 42 percent; Republic of the Philippines, and Cuba, 49 percent each; full duty countries, 44 percent; and the Virgin Islands, 17 percent.

4. During April 1955, the Southern region took 31 percent of total sugar deliveries, the North Central region 28 percent, the Middle Atlantic region 24 percent, the Western region 12 percent, and the New England region 5 percent. Of the beet sugar deliveries, 59 percent went to the North Central region, 35 percent to the Western, and 5 percent to the Southern region. Beet sugar represented 45 percent of total sugar deliveries to the North Central region and 59 percent to the Western region. The Middle Atlantic and Southern regions each took 41 percent of the total deliveries by importers of direct-consumption sugar. The North Central region took 62 percent and the Southern region 38 percent of the deliveries by mainland cane sugar mills. Cane sugar refiners' deliveries went to all States and the District of Columbia, with 37 percent to the Southern region, 29 percent to the Middle Atlantic region, 20 percent to the North Central region, and the remainder about equally divided between the New England and Western regions.

Table 1 .-Distribution of sugar by primary distributors in the continental United States, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii during January-April 1955 and 1954

	1955 (short tons, raw value)	1954 (short tons, raw value)
<u>Continental United States</u>		
Refiners' raw	275	447
Refiners' refined	1,728,358	1,786,289
Beet processors	526,986	478,776
Importers' direct-consumption	190,621	156,184
Mainland sugarcane mills: direct-consumption	32,535	45,960
Total	2,478,775	2,467,656
Deliveries for export, livestock feed, etc.	15,932	10,735
For continental consumption <u>1/</u>	2,462,843	2,456,921
<u>Puerto Rico</u>	26,762	30,039
<u>Hawaii</u>	13,094	13,059

1/ Includes deliveries for United States military forces at home and abroad.

Table 2 .-Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, April 30, 1955 and 1954

	1955 (short tons, raw value)	1954 (short tons, raw value)
Refiners' raw	327,593	327,013
Refiners' refined	290,604	294,806
Beet processors	979,511	814,349
Importers' direct-consumption	87,794	68,116
Mainland sugarcane mills	67,054	63,417
	1,752,556	1,567,701

Table 3 .- Raw sugar: Refiners' stocks, receipts and meltings January-April 1955 1/

	(short tons, raw value)
Stocks, January 1, 1955	249,840
Receipts	1,914,032
Meltings	1,836,004
Deliveries for direct consumption	275
Stocks, April 30, 1955	327,593

1/ For receipts by source of supply, see Table 7.

Source: Compiled from reports on Form SU-15A from cane sugar refiners.

Table 4 .- Refined sugar; refiners' and beet processors' stocks, production and deliveries, January-April 1955

	Cane sugar (short tons, raw value)	Beet sugar (short tons, raw value)
Stocks, January 1, 1955	185,983	1,305,931
Production	1,832,979	200,566
Deliveries	1,728,358	526,986
Stocks, April 30, 1955	290,604	979,511

Source: Compiled from reports on Form SU-16A and SU-70 from cane sugar refiners and beet sugar processors, respectively.

Table 5 . - Direct-consumption sugar: Importers' stocks, receipts and deliveries, January-April 1955 1/

	(short tons, raw value)
Stocks, January 1, 1955	23,310
Receipts	255,105
Deliveries	190,621
Stocks, April 30, 1955	87,794

1/ For receipt by source of supply, see Table 7 .

Source: Compiled from reports on Form SU-75 and 15B from importers of direct-consumption sugar.

Table 6 .- Mainland sugarcane mills' stocks, production and deliveries of sugar, January-April, 1955

	(short tons, raw value)
Stocks, January 1, 1955	163,122
Production	97,067
Deliveries:	
For further processing	160,600
For direct consumption	32,535
Total	193,135
Stocks, April 30, 1955	67,054

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by mainland sugarcane processors and processor-refiners.

Table 7.-Refiners and importers: Receipts by source of supply
January-April 1955

Source of Supply	Refiners	Importers
	(raw sugar)	(DC sugar)
	(short tons, raw value)	
Cuba	976,868	166,058
Hawaii	205,734	6,618
Mainland cane area	163,288	-
Philippines, Republic of the	324,016	1,632
Puerto Rico	237,512	44,760
Virgin Islands	1,989	-
Other countries	3,830	36,037
Not identifiable	795 1/	-
Total	1,914,032	255,105

1/ Substantially all damaged refined cane and beet sugars.

Table 8.-Distribution of sugar by primary distributors in the
continental United States, May and January-May, 1955 and 1954

	1955 1/		1954	
	May	Jan-May	May	Jan.-May
	(short tons, raw value)			
Refiners	479,042	2,207,675	438,099	2,224,835
Beet processors	152,666	679,652	155,046	633,822
Importers	62,246	252,867	58,895	215,079
Mainland sugarcane mills	4,071	36,606	6,052	52,012
Total	698,025	3,176,800	658,092	3,125,748
Deliveries for export, livestock feed, etc.	2,482	18,414	2,720	13,455
For continental consumption 2/	695,543	3,158,386	655,372	3,112,293

1/ Preliminary

2/ Includes deliveries for U.S. military forces at home and abroad

Table 9.-Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the
continental United States, June 4, 1955 and May 31, 1954

	1955 1/	1954
	(short tons, raw value)	
Refiners' raw	371,696	386,487
Refiners' refined	300,760	328,559
Beet processors	840,053	716,072
Importers	78,667	89,116
Mainland sugarcane mills	67,000 2/	54,091
Total	1,658,176	1,574,325

1/ Preliminary

2/ Not available; estimated.

Table 10. - Status of 1955 Sugar Quotas as of May 31, 1955

Area	Quota	Credit for draw- back of duty	Charge to quota & offset to draw- back of duty 1/		Unfilled balance	
			Total	Direct consump- tion from offshore areas 2/	Total	Within dir- ect consump- tion limits for offshore areas
Short tons, raw value						
Domestic Beet	1,800,000		678,850	3/	1,121,150	
Mainland Cane	500,000		261,723	3/	238,277	
Hawaii	1,052,000		297,761	12,567	754,239	17,049
Puerto Rico	1,080,000		449,120	67,556	630,880	58,477
Virgin Islands	12,000		1,988		10,012	
Republic of the Philippines	977,000	0	477,767	4,547	499,233	55,373
Cuba	2,667,840	1116	1,308,980	201,446	1,359,976	173,561
Other foreign countries (see below)	111,160	149	49,070	37,788	62,239	6
Total	8,200,000	1265	3,525,259	323,904	4,676,006	304,466
Foreign countries other than Cuba and Republic of the Philippines						
Dominican Republic	27,605	72	17,509	8,372	10,168	)
El Salvador	4,136	0	0	0	4,136	)
Haiti	2,671	0	0	0	2,671	)
Mexico	11,445	4	11,334	9,189	115	) 6
Nicaragua	7,823	0	7,815	7,815	8	)
Peru	51,922	73	6,854	6,854	45,141	)
Unspecified countries (those without indi- vidual prorations)						
	5,558	0	5,558	4/	5,558	0 5/)
Total	111,160	149	49,070	37,788	62,239	

LIQUID SUGAR 6/

wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content						
Cuba	7,970,558	-	7,402,916	-	567,642	-
Dominican Republic	830,894	-	4,127	-	826,767	-
British West Indies	300,000	-	0	-	300,000	-

- 1/ These data include the following: (a) Domestic Beet and Mainland Cane sugar marketed through May 31, 1955; (b) raw sugar from Hawaii, and all sugar from the Republic of the Philippines and Cuba entered through May 31, 1955, as shown by quota clearance papers received in the Sugar Division by June 13, 1955; and (c) direct-consumption sugar from Hawaii, and all sugar from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and "other foreign countries" entered or certified for entry as of May 31, 1955.
- 2/ Includes raw sugar for direct-consumption: Cuba, 6227; Philippines, 110; Puerto Rico, 79.
- 3/ Partly estimated.
- 4/ Belgium, 229; China (Formosa), 1109; Costa Rica, 939; Denmark, 1112; Netherlands, 1112; Panama, 1046; Hong Kong, 11; total 5558. The above countries entered 10 tons each under Section 212 in addition to amounts shown. Also entered under Section 212 were 2 tons from Canada; 9 tons from Colombia and 10 tons from each of the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom.
- 5/ Applications being held pending availability of quota comprise; China (Formosa), 1259; Colombia, 2584; Costa Rica, 1216; Denmark, 42; Hong Kong, 46; Netherlands, 935; total 6082.
- 6/ 11,102 gallons entered by United Kingdom under Sec. 212.

Table 11.-Comparison of charges to quotas and offsets to drawback of duty
January - May 1955 and 1954

(short tons, raw value and percentages)

Area	1955 1/ Tons	1954 2/ Tons	Increase		Decrease	
			Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
Domestic beet	678,850	630,081	48,769	7.7		
Mainland Cane	261,723 3/	181,244 4/	80,479	44.4		
Hawaii	297,761	301,550			3,789	1.3
Puerto Rico	449,120	476,508			27,388	5.7
Virgin Islands	1,988	2,255			267	11.8
Republic of the Philippines	477,767	421,996	55,771	13.2		
Cuba	1,308,980	1,496,703			187,723	12.5
Other Foreign Countries (see below)	49,070	32,354	16,716	51.7		
Total	3,525,259	3,542,691			17,432	.5
Foreign countries other than Cuba and Republic of the Philippines						
Dominican Republic	17,509	7,835	9,674			
El Salvador	0	0				
Haiti	0	2,457			2,457	
Mexico	11,334	8,313	3,021			
Nicaragua	7,815	5,057	2,758			
Peru	6,854	3,130	3,724			
Unspecified countries (those without in- dividual prorations)	5,558	5,562			4	
Total	49,070	32,354	16,716	51.7		

LIQUID SUGAR

(wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content)				
Cuba	7,402,916	4,131,661	3,271,255	79.2
Dominican Republic	4,127	0	4,127	
British West Indies	0	0		

1/ These data include the following: (a) Domestic Beet and Mainland Cane sugar marketed through May 31, 1955; (b)-raw sugar from Hawaii, and all sugar from the Republic of the Philippines and Cuba entered through May 31, 1955, as shown by quota clearance papers received in the Sugar Division by June 13, 1955; and (c) direct-consumption sugar from Hawaii, and all sugar from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and "other foreign countries" entered or certified for entry as of May 31, 1955.

2/ Charges to quota made upon marketing, entry, or certification for entry.

3/ May 1955 estimated same as May 1954.

4/ Revised.

Table 12.- Status of 1955 Sugar Quotas on June 13, 1955

Area	Quota	Credit for draw- back of duty	Charge to quota & offset to draw- back of duty 1/		Unfilled balance	
			Total	Direct consump- tion from offshore areas 2/	Total	Within dir- ect consump- tion limits for offshore areas
Short tons, raw value						
Domestic Beet	1,800,000		763,850	3/	1,036,150	
Mainland Cane	500,000		269,723	3/	230,277	
Hawaii	1,052,000		321,726	12,567	730,274	17,049
Puerto Rico	1,080,000		479,956	72,914	600,044	53,119
Virgin Islands	12,000		1,988		10,012	
Republic of the Philippines	977,000	0	499,482	4,548	477,518	55,372
Cuba	2,667,840	1116	1,323,903	209,294	1,345,053	165,713
Other foreign countries (see below)	111,160	149	52,745	37,788	58,564	6
Total	8,200,000	1265	3,713,373	337,111	4,487,892	291,259
Foreign countries other than Cuba and Republic of the Philippines						
Dominican Republic	27,605	72	21,184	8,372	6,421	)
El Salvador	4,136	0	0	0	4,136	)
Haiti	2,671	0	0	0	2,671	)
Mexico	11,445	4	11,334	9,189	111	) 6
Nicaragua	7,823	0	7,815	7,815	8	)
Peru	51,922	73	6,854	6,854	45,068	)
Unspecified countries (those without indi- vidual prorations)	5,558		5,558	4/	5,558	0 5/)
Total	111,160	149	52,745	37,788	58,415	

LIQUID SUGAR 6/

(Wine gallons of 72 per cent total sugar content)		
Cuba	7,970,558	7,402,916
Dominican Republic	830,894	4,127
British West Indies	300,000	0
		300,000

- 1/ These data include the following: (a) Domestic Beet and Mainland Cane sugar reported as marketed through May 31, 1955, and estimated marketings between June 1-13, 1955; (b) raw sugar from Hawaii, and all sugar from the Republic of the Philippines and Cuba entered through June 13, 1955, as shown by quota clearance papers received in the Sugar Division by June 13, 1955; and (c) direct-consumption sugar from Hawaii, and all sugar from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and "other foreign countries" entered or certified for entry as of June 13, 1955.
- 2/ Includes raw sugar for direct-consumption: Cuba, 6227; Philippines, 110; Puerto Rico, 79.
- 3/ Partly estimated.
- 4/ Belgium, 229; China (Formosa), 1109; Costa Rica, 939; Denmark, 1112; Netherlands, 1112; Panama, 1046; Hong Kong, 11; total 5558. The above countries entered 10 tons each under Section 212 in addition to amounts shown. Also entered under Section 212 were 2 tons from Canada; 9 tons from Colombia and 10 tons from each of the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom.
- 5/ Applications being held pending availability of quota comprise; China (Formosa), 1259; Colombia, 2584; Costa Rica, 1216; Denmark, 42; Hong Kong, 46; Netherlands, 935; total 6082.
- 6/ 11,102 gallons entered by United Kingdom under Sec. 212.

Table 13.- Deliveries of sugar by primary distributors by states, April 1955

State	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct-consump- tion sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
New England					
	100-pound bags, refined equivalent				
Connecticut	85,937		3,875		89,812
Maine	50,225		632		50,857
Massachusetts	374,924		23,201		398,125
New Hampshire	27,588		535		28,123
Rhode Island	47,701		1,320		49,021
Vermont	15,181		9,000		24,181
Total	601,556		38,563		640,119
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	490,380		74,001		564,381
New York	1,100,041	17,890	146,254		1,264,185
Pennsylvania	683,016		223,420	25	906,461
Total	2,273,437	17,890	443,675	25	2,735,027
North Central					
Illinois	370,302	583,255		35,117	988,674
Indiana	217,708	96,985	4,510		319,203
Iowa	51,652	86,534			138,186
Kansas	38,184	72,865			111,049
Michigan	156,981	177,479	69,363	1,605	405,428
Minnesota	28,183	99,346			127,529
Missouri	170,070	80,373			250,443
Nebraska	26,795	75,740		900	103,435
North Dakota	2,160	15,992			18,152
Ohio	452,111	40,036	45,446	78	537,671
South Dakota	3,830	19,468			23,298
Wisconsin	105,136	97,245			202,381
Total	1,623,112	1,445,318	119,319	37,700	3,225,449
Southern					
Alabama	196,493			3,600	200,093
Arkansas	86,671	4,000			90,671
Delaware	10,994				10,994
Dist. of Columbia	38,556		3,020		41,576
Florida	93,044		121,849	11,753	226,646
Georgia	318,079		56,497		374,576
Kentucky	164,542	9,000	660		174,202
Louisiana	295,587			6,619	302,206
Maryland	240,949		71,167		312,116
Mississippi	140,146			350	140,496
North Carolina	200,150		61,979		262,129
Oklahoma	78,158	32,492		200	110,850
South Carolina	118,827		9,359		128,186
Tennessee	287,550		2,770	329	290,649
Texas	480,840	81,040	41,648	1	603,529
Virginia	140,834		66,199	1	207,034
West Virginia	65,138		7,706		72,844
Total	2,956,558	126,532	442,854	22,853	3,548,797
Western					
Arizona	21,503	14,398			35,901
California	434,388	504,836	1,837	600	941,661
Colorado	4,594	65,863	24		70,481
Idaho	5,177	18,534			23,711
Montana	1,703	22,308			24,011
Nevada	5,113	2,941			8,054
New Mexico	5,929	11,181			17,110
Oregon	27,154	47,019	15,457		89,630
Utah	6,614	56,227			62,841
Washington	32,340	90,219	26,461		149,020
Wyoming	1,244	8,474			9,718
Total	545,759	842,000	43,779	600	1,432,138
GRAND TOTAL	8,000,422	2,431,740	1,088,190	61,178	11,581,530

